

Claims 1 and 20 each recite a “graphical user interface configured to display a channel list including at least one television channel and at least one internet channel concurrently.” Claim 6 recites “one or more channel lists integrating the television channels and the internet channels.” Claim 15 recites “channel lists integrating one or more television channels and one or more internet channels.” Claim 17 recites providing “one or more channel lists” which “integrate one or more television channels and one or more internet channels.” Claim 19 recites “including at least one television channel and at least one internet channel concurrently in a list.”

In contrast, Klosterman does not integrate internet and television channels into a single display, as is required by the present claims. The Office Action asserts that Klosterman teaches a graphical user interface configured to display a channel list including both internet and television channels. However, a reading of Klosterman shows this to be incorrect. Klosterman at col. 9, lines 19-53 describes Figures 6a, 6b, and 6c, which are relied upon in the office Action. It is clear not only from a viewing of the Figures but also from a reading of the text that at no time does Klosterman have a unified graphical user interface. Instead, what Klosterman shows is three separate and distinct screens, each of which contains either television channel references, or internet channel references, but never both. At no point in Klosterman are internet and television channels present in the same graphical user interface. Specifically, Figure 6b, as described in Klosterman, contains virtual channel 640 and an information region 620. No television channel lists are present. Figure 6c, as described in Klosterman, contains three web site icons 660, 665, and 669. No television channel lists are present. Instead, separate screens are used in Klosterman for television and for internet channels. They are not combined in a single GUI as required by the present claims.

As Klosterman does not contain each and every element of the claims, claims 1, 6, 15, 17, 19 and 20 are believed allowable. The remaining claims depend from and further define one of patentably distinct claims 1, 6, 15, 17, 19 or 20, and are also believed allowable.


The drawings will be corrected per the request of the Office Action upon an indication of allowability of the claims.

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE

Serial Number: 09/002,944

Filing Date: January 5, 1998

Title: INTEGRATION OF INTERNET SOURCES INTO AN ELECTRONIC PROGRAM DATABASE LIST



Page 3
Dkt: 450.208US1

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (612-373-6944) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0439.

Respectfully submitted,

THEODORE D. WUGOFSKI ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 373-6944

Date 10 Feb 2000

By

Daniel J. Polglaze
Reg. No. 39,801

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Assistant Commissioner of Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 on **February 10, 2000**.

Daniel Polgalze
Name


Signature

RECEIVED
FEB 22 2000
TECH CENTER 2100